

## **COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT**

**March 14, 2005**

**Immediately following Committee on Traffic**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Lopez  
Alderman DeVries

Messrs.: Deputy City Solicitor Arnold, Kevin Dillon, Ron Ludwig  
Tom Lolicata, Bob MacKenzie, Sam Maranto, Frank Thomas

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Chairman O'Neil stated normally we would take new business up at the end of the meeting but Mr. Dillon has asked if he could address an issue at the beginning of the meeting as he needs to get down to a meeting with the Town Council in Londonderry, so if the Committee is okay with that I'd like to ask Kevin Dillon to come forward. Did everybody get a copy of the memo?

Communication from the Airport Director requesting to amend CIP projects (enclosed herein).

Resolution:

“Amending the FY2001 and FY2002 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Forth Three Million Six Hundred Six Thousand Three Hundred Thirty Three Dollars (\$43,606,333.00) for the Manchester Airport Capital Improvement Program.”

Mr. Kevin Dillon, Airport Director, stated basically what we're looking to do is amend a couple of CIP projects and increase the authorization under those projects. You should have in front of you an amending resolution. The first project is the Property Acquisition Project...essentially we're looking to increase that authorization by a little bit over \$4.1 million and that's for the acquisition of Summit and Aerohex properties. We've talked about those properties, they've been approved by the Board...now, we're really going back for housekeeping

purposes to adjust the CIP project to reflect that. We're also looking to increase the CIP project for the Runway/Apron Improvements...essentially that is an increase of about \$30 million that includes the Reconstruction of Runway 6, Runway 6 needs to be reconstructed from the intersection all the way to the Runway 6 end. We also have some dollars included for reconstruction/rehabilitation of two taxiways and also to extend the Runway 24 safety overrun area. We've also included \$2 million in that amount for a Glycol Collection System at the Airport. You've probably heard that there are issues with deicing at the Airport in terms of the utilization of Glycol that has been causing some concern with the surrounding community in relation to odors that the Glycol emits. So, we've budgeted \$2 million for a Glycol Collection System. We also have an increase in the roadway and parking improvements CIP project of almost \$4 million...that's \$3.7 million...for the demolition of the Summit building now that we are purchasing the property and it's also for the demolition of the Meggitt building that will be coming to us based on the expiration of the Meggitt lease in the Spring of 2006. We also have dollars in there for the reconstruction and extension of Parking Lot C into those areas. We're also asking for an increase of \$6 million to the Residential Sound Insulation Program. We're asking for that \$6 million simply because the Airport received some additional grants that we didn't expect...the majority of that \$6 million is federal grants, about \$4.8 million that's coming from the federal government...then we have a matching share from the State of about \$300,000 and then \$900,000 will be local Airport funds. So, essentially, that is what we're looking to do. I do have a map here if you're interested in seeing the location of any of those projects.

Alderman Lopez moved to approve the Airport Director's request as presented including the resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$165,039 (State) for the 2005 CIP 210305 Public Health Services.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the resolution and budget authorization as presented. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, advising that MNHS has requested the City to consider subordination of a \$10,000 lien on a vacant lot abutting property located adjacent to 128 Auburn Street, which they currently have under a P&S agreement. MHNS would use the lot as open space for use by the residents of Renaissance IV.

Alderman Smith moved to approve the request. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated just a point. Although the item on the item says subordination what they are actually looking for is that for the mortgage to be discharged.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion as clarified by Deputy City Solicitor Arnold. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Estimate for the Amory Street Fire Station emergency traffic signal submitted by the Traffic Department.

Alderman Shea moved that item 5 be referred to the CIP budget process. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Granite Street Improvements (long-range CIP planning).

Chairman O'Neil stated I thought we had taken care of this but Frank maybe needs to update us as to where everything stands.

Mr. Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated for information the State's "B" contract was awarded in February...approximately \$9 million that included the demolition of some of that property over the west side and will include the relocation of the interceptor sewer and Allard Drive...that project is moving along...that project is being partially funded with the sewer user fees and work

from the State. The Granite Street Project itself is proceeding the way we had defined to this Committee early on. We've broken the project into three parts... the west side of Granite Street or the widening on the west side of the river is now included under the State's "C" contract, so not only will the State be doing the widening of the Everett Turnpike, the widening of the bridge over Granite Street and the construction of the new full interchange but they will also be doing the widening of Granite Street. The reason for that was to minimize two contractor's working in the same location, the need for coordination in delaying of certain work we felt that that would be more cost-effective...the City share of that project is approximately \$2 million...that project is going out-to-bid in the May/June time frame...the next project that the City is doing is the widening of the bridge itself. The widening of the bridge to 7 lanes in a northerly direction and retaining wall work in the area of Jillian's parking lot; that project is going to be advertised approximately a month after the State project so I said May/June for the State project this would be June/July. We wanted to allow the State project to move ahead and the way we broke this into a bridge job we hope to entice some bridge contractors or potentially even the State contractor and that project is approximately \$11 million. A year later will be the last phase of the widening project which is expected to go out-to-bid in May of '06 and would include the widening of Granite Street from approximately Commercial Street all the way up to Elm Street. Again, we're breaking this into three different phases so that we can hopefully entice the roadway contractors to look at the roadway project, the bridge contractors to look at the bridge work and include that first phase under the State project to eliminate conflicts. We are proceeding in that direct and we will keep you informed as the bids come in.

Chairman O'Neil stated, Frank, my understanding...the key time period of where we sit with the entire project will be after the major State project bids and then after the widening of the bridge itself...the City bids that.

Mr. Thomas stated that is correct. By the end of the summer we should have a good handle on exactly how much it's going to cost the City to widen the west side of Granite Street as part of the large phase project and we will also have the bids in for the widening of the bridge. So, we will have a very good idea of how we're standing and exactly what kind of benefits we've realized by breaking this project up into three phases.

Alderman Shea asked, Frank, the beginning is going to be when?

Mr. Thomas replied the first project, the west side widening which is included with the large State project will be going out-to-bid in May/June of this year.

Alderman Shea stated the final date for the completion of everything.

Mr. Thomas stated all work is scheduled to be completed at the same time. The State's projects and our projects should be in the late fall of 2007.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't think we need to take any action on this it's just informational. Thank you, Frank.

Alderman Lopez asked could you give us an update at some point on The Hands Across The Merrimack.

Mr. Thomas stated I would be glad to at the next CIP meeting. The design work is going on. I don't know the status of the fund raising that I would have to check into.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Master Plan update.

Chairman O'Neil stated could you give the Committee an update, I know that staff has selected a consultant and I know you're ready to get going on it.

Mr. Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery, stated you are correct. We did interview three firms, we selected the firm of Peter J. Smith and Company, out of Buffalo, New York as my letter indicates. They have excellent experience in overall master planning which is one of the items we felt if there were weaknesses in the other firms that had more site specific master planning experiences, but the Peter Smith Company out of Buffalo seemed to have the most experience in doing overall master plans...we checked several recommendations of different towns and cities that they have done work for and they came highly recommended. We did have some reservations about the fact that they come from Buffalo but after the way they explained to us that they present their plan and do their work I think the committee members were fairly comfortable in terms of buying into the fact that they do a lot in Buffalo but when they spend time here in Manchester it will be time well spent and that you'll see a lot of them. They actually asked to come in next week and then when I looked at the Board of Mayor and Aldermen schedule I believe there was a meeting scheduled for Monday the twenty-eighth...it's kind of a different Board of Mayor and Aldermen meeting night but I believe that was the night I asked them to make plans to come in and not necessarily give a lengthy presentation but just give us an opportunity to introduce them to the full Board for five minutes so that all four Board members

will be seeing these people around at one level or another in the next seven months. So, they will be here on the 28<sup>th</sup> and I will ask the Clerk's office to put them in not for a lengthy presentation, just five minutes...here's the group of people in case you see them around in the City so everyone will know who they are...on the 29<sup>th</sup> obviously they're coming from Buffalo and will be spending the day touring all of our park facilities and I think it's a good thing that we delayed it a little bit because a lot of our facilities are still snow covered at this point and that will give them an opportunity in a full day to tour every facility that we can show them in the City. On the 30<sup>th</sup> we will actually meet with them for two hours in the morning, we've put together a small steering committee of Parks and Rec. Commissioners, Joe Raycraft from the Manchester School District will be on the committee, Sam has agreed to do it from Planning, so we have a pretty good group of people who can meet with them for two hours and start the kick off. The project will include...I did do a little bit of extra negotiating with them, a maintenance management study of all of our facilities that will tie in, they agreed to do it for an amount. As you remember, this Board did allow us to have a few dollars extra at the stroke of midnight and they have agreed to do a maintenance management study which I think speaks well for them as a company that will address maintenance which we all know is an issue in all of the parks and how we're addressing it. And, finally, we've asked them to wrap the project up more in the September/October timeframe only because we felt that if it's wrapped up in August the Board members may not be around and there may not be as much interest, so they have agreed to that timeframe as well.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm wondering if you could tell me the expectations of the final product that we will see. When we look at a specific park, say let's pick Derryfield for an example. Is it going to show us actual new proposed site locations for improvements, will it be that specific with site plans...what do you expect to see for a finished product?

Mr. Ludwig replied I think an overall master plan will show you your strengths and weaknesses as far as Parks and Recreation are concerned and it really doesn't go into site specific planning. That comes as a result of this master plan being done, so there will be a lot of inventory analysis in Phase I and will probably have a two-person team coming in to do that. Phase II would be more of the public outreach...they actually have a plan where they go out and do mailings and talking to different groups and organizations and then the final project preparation of Parks and Recreation Master Plan would be more or less the entire project. So, no I don't see them going into site specific plans necessarily but I don't think that is what we were looking for.

Chairman O'Neil stated if I may, Ron, they may suggest you have a softball field here that doesn't appear to be used, you may want to consider conceptually making it a soccer field although I don't believe they're going to go into any designs or a soccer field.

Mr. Ludwig stated that's true.

Alderman DeVries stated so with that in mind if I have a specific park that I'm trying to figure out the best way to utilize the grounds today available for future needs I would need to ask for a site plan to be done on that particular property as opposed to asking for a master plan, we need to ask for a site plan to identify where maybe a playground would fit or other types of improvements.

Mr. Ludwig stated I think that's true. I think, hopefully, the plan...we recognize as we all know that there are some deficiencies in south Manchester, it will say that but it won't say specifically what should be on a particular site. I think one of the things that we'll definitely identify is the shortage of available land for recreational development in south Manchester and hopefully direct this Board in terms of maybe putting some money aside down the road to do those kinds of things. I think one of the things we were exciting about the Peter J. Smith Company was it wasn't just...they really weren't just interested in coming here and doing this project unless they felt they could come here and try to sell their end result to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in terms of economic development and how economic development is an important part of parks and recreation is a huge portion of what economic development is in the City. As we know schools, fire and police and always are but one of the big things they felt that in this day and age is how huge parks and recreation and open space facilities are and they had a huge emphasis on that and they really impressed the committee members in terms of laying out those aspects of their plan and I think that's really important to us in helping in the selection of them.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

8. Synthetic turf maintenance at Gill Stadium, West Memorial Field, and the Clem Lemire Sports Complex at Memorial High School and a list of additional capital items needed to properly operate Gill Stadium.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to remove item 8 from the table for discussion.

Chairman O'Neil stated we all should be in receipt of a letter from the Director I think dated February 22<sup>nd</sup>. I can only give you my suggestion and I have not had a chance to talk to Ron about this but I do appreciate the effort that they put in. I think until we get a rhythm with this it would be in our best interest to rent the equipment because the assumptions here are based on the fact that, if I recall, they're giving themselves two weeks to change it over in the spring time and two weeks to change it over in the fall and that would be for the 10-year period. I'm hoping after they get a little bit of experience under their belts as they learned from last year when they changed it over to the fall season...my suggestion would be that, I think, until we get to find out just how long it takes to do this it might be in our best interest to rent. He's identified that we can rent the equipment and I can only...from my days of being an electrical contractor, I can only make a similar or comparison to having a scissor lift to do height work...I never could afford to own one I'd have to rent one and get the most use out of it either on a daily rental or if I rented it as a weekly rental...so, that's just my opinion. I think they need to get some time under their belt with this, they need to do a season or two of changing it over each way and until they do that I'm not sure that the financial comparison they did would be accurate because I'm hoping as time went on they would actually get a little quicker with it than as projected here. So, that's my opinion.

Alderman Lopez stated I might agree with you but I just want to make sure that Gill Stadium is going to be taken care of and the money that we're going to be giving for the equipment if he rents it at some point later on maybe a year down the road we'll have to take a look at it and if it's to buy the equipment fine but I just want to make sure that come May, June, July and August that an issue doesn't come back to this Board that things will be done at Gill Stadium according to make sure it's cleaned and the investment we put in and if the Superintendent is comfortable with that, I have no problem.

Mr. Ludwig stated I don't necessarily disagree with Alderman O'Neil's assessment is that other than we have given it some time, we worked the transfer on our sliding boxes and pitchers mounds and things like that...one of the things I think Aldermen shouldn't be confused about is the fact that it's not just seasonally...I think that today and tomorrow if we had this piece of equipment on board right now we'd be cleaning the infield of this ballpark right now as we speak. So, it's a piece of equipment that ultimately is needed on a day-to-day basis. Do we use the backhoe at the ballpark everyday, no we won't. I don't think Highway uses backhoes everyday that I see sitting in their yard either, that doesn't mean they're not using them or they don't need them...there is some down time for these types of equipment but quite honestly this is a piece of equipment with the one or two people we typically have stationed at Gill Stadium to maintain it all



year it really needs to be at their disposal over periods of time, it's a thing that takes much planning if you want to go and rent...when you want to go and rent it it's not available...our piece of equipment would come...as I noted in my explanation here a laymore brush which means we can go out there and brush and even redistribute crumb rubber on a regular basis. So, we're not mowing. Alderman O'Neil's comments are well taken, I think that I demonstrated...in this little analysis here we really tried to be fair in this analysis, we did not try to build in anything here...we gave you the minimum amount of times that we would have to go out and use the piece of equipment and I think it's fair and I think you can see that. It also says that there will be many more times in between when we would need this piece of equipment available whether it's for just landscaping and issues around the ballpark, this is a piece of equipment we would be using to do some of the landscaping that is really non-existent around the ballpark right now even though we are in really great shape there are a lot of other things for us to do. So, I hear him loud and clear but I think when you have a \$4.5 million facility and you can't afford a \$29,000 tractor that you might want to revisit it.

Chairman O'Neil stated we did okay already the utility vehicle, which should be part of the maintenance program as well.

Mr. Ludwig stated it is.

Alderman Shea asked what are we actually talking about? If we rented versus if we buy it, how much of a difference are we talking about?

Mr. Ludwig replied the anticipated projected annual savings in purchases of about \$766.00. The machine costs over...for a 10-year period...about \$29,000 and I had listed some rental fees in here that we said we would have to...the tractor would be rented for four weeks annually, two in the spring and two in the autumn and the broom which is an attachment would be rented for three days annually. Again, these are bare minimums that we projected. So, if we rented...\$825 for four weeks you're at \$3,300 plus \$150 times three days is \$450 or \$3,750 versus the \$29,834 to purchase it which is a difference of \$766 a year. But, I think more importantly we were honest in our project in terms of how much we would use it. This is the minimal amount of time we would use it.

Alderman Shea stated I can't see renting it. We're talking about paying \$4 million and we're talking about renting and saving, I don't know how much, we're going to save how much by renting.

Mr. Ludwig stated the cost of \$766 a year to rent over and above the cost of the purchase of the equipment...minimal because we know that this tractor...we're going to have to go rent it more often than we're even saying but we were honest in our projections in terms of the rent.

Alderman Shea stated if we don't rent it we're going to have to pay what \$29,000 minus what we've already...so, actually we're talking about the difference between \$10,000 and \$800 +/- dollars, is that it because we've already purchased the \$19,000, right. According to my list we're talking about the backhoe assembly and...

Mr. Ludwig stated we have approval to move forward with the utility vehicle, which is like a small vehicle...

Chairman O'Neil interjected no this is a different piece of equipment than that. We've already okayed the basic utility vehicle.

Alderman Shea asked so what are we talking about then?

Chairman O'Neil replied this is a mini loader/backhoe...

Mr. Ludwig interjected a compact tractor with a bucket and a backhoe.

Alderman Shea asked that costs how much?

Mr. Ludwig replied \$29,000 which a brush attachment to brush the grass.

Alderman Shea asked could we rent it over the course of the year we're going to pay how much.

Mr. Ludwig stated \$766 more than if we purchased it over a 10-year period.

Chairman O'Neil stated that's over a 10-year period not annually. The annual cost would be somewhere around \$3,700.

Alderman Shea stated so \$3,700 versus \$29,000 is that correct.

Mr. Ludwig stated if you take a 10-year life of the tractor at \$29,000 you have \$2,983 per year to own it for 10 years. If you take the price of renting...the minimal amount of times you're at \$3,750 for a difference of \$766 more. So, it's

costing you...if you figure the life of the tractor over a 10-year period \$2,983. If you rent every year right now at a minimal amount of time it's \$3,750...a difference of \$766 per year.

Chairman O'Neil stated the only thing, Ron, that's not in here is there is no maintenance in here over that 10-year period. You need to change the oil, replace parts, all that stuff...I appreciate the exercise you went through although I'm not sure it's 100%...that's why I'm saying I'd rather see us get a little rhythm, figure out what our true needs are with it for a couple of seasons and then make the decision; that's my point.

Alderman Shea asked don't you know what you're needs are?

Mr. Ludwig replied we think we've got a better handle on it. Again, like I said today I talked to the Maintenance Supervisor, Roger Grandmaison and e-mailed him several times about if it was me today and I had that tractor we would have cleaned off the infield.

Alderman Shea stated you're the department head would you rather we purchased it or we rented.

Mr. Ludwig replied I think the City needs what it needs down there at the ballpark right now and it's ready to move forward with this piece.

Alderman Shea moved to approve purchase of the tractor for \$29,000. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith stated it reminds me of the story that you buy a fire truck and it costs \$80,000 but you don't have the gas to operate it, this is the same thing. We put \$4 million into a field and if you're going to do it do it right. I believe in purchasing equipment fully, I believe in maintaining it. I was probably one of the only ones when they were up there putting it in, taking it out with the equipment and we had one employee get hurt up there...do you remember that, you were up there, Ron, and that's because of inadequate equipment at the time. Now, you can rent all the time but I believe in having it and you'd have it for 365 days, you might be able to utilize it during a snow storm and so forth and I think it's well taken...everybody's entitled to their opinion, but since we put so much money into it I can't see not purchasing and doing it first-class. Thank you.

Alderman Garrity asked do we have a funding source?

Mr. Ludwig replied yes funds are in place.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the funding source?

Mr. Ludwig replied I believe there were funds transferred...there was a meeting maybe two weeks ago.

Alderman Lopez stated the funding is in place and to be finally approved...the other \$18,000 is on tomorrow night's BMA agenda which will give him the necessary funds to move forward to purchase this. But I must be fair because the Chairman...it was part of the motion to be up to this Committee to move forward whether we spend those funds and the Chairman made his viewpoints known.

Alderman Garrity stated so there's \$18,000 available, right from what we already agreed we would purchase...it cost \$29,000.

Alderman Lopez stated there is other money that we approved from another line item...the \$18,000 is coming from Contingency and we moved other monies from other locations, so he does have the money...again, it's up to this Committee because that was the motion.

Alderman Smith stated in regard to this this is \$215, \$205...we're short \$44,000...we approved \$26,000 that evening and the other \$18,000 is supposed to come before us tomorrow night giving us a total of \$44,000. So, I think if we okay this we'd be able to purchase the equipment.

Chairman O'Neil stated I will make just one final comment. I think some of the issues with Gill...we've got start running it like a business and I think, for instance, I'm pretty sure of this and Frank will correct me...Frank rents backhoes or leases backhoes for 6-9 months of the year for sewer projects...am I correct, Frank. And, the point being is you don't buy equipment...you can come forward...you buy equipment that you're going to use everyday. Now Frank obviously would not use a large backhoe to do sewer projects in December, January, February so he doesn't buy a backhoe he leases one for the construction season...Frank.

Mr. Thomas stated for street reconstruction work we rent a large backhoe for the construction season that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated my point being it's not going to be a piece of equipment he can use year round so he doesn't buy it, he leases it for the period that it's really needed and that's my whole point here. We're scrapping to pay money for the

lighting program and we're buying a piece of equipment that's not going to be used every single day and that's my whole...I had no problem with the utility vehicle because it is something that is going to be used March 1<sup>st</sup> through the end of November.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve \$29,000 for the purchase of equipment. The motion carried with Aldermen Garrity and O'Neil duly recorded in opposition.

9. Communication from Dayton and Concepcion Spaulding regarding drainage issues in the Pasture Drive development area.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove item 9 from the table for discussion.

Chairman O'Neil stated believe a motion would be in order to receive and file. Hopefully, everybody saw the letter from the Solicitor.

Alderman Lopez moved to receive and file item 9. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

10. Petition for discontinuance of a portion of ROW at 466 So. Willow Street submitted by Frederick Nixon.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to remove item 10 from the agenda for discussion.

Alderman Garrity moved to receive and file item 10. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

11. Communication from Aldermen Garrity and O'Neil requesting the Highway Department review the situation at the intersection of So. Willow Street and So. Maple Streets and report back to the Committee with recommendations for improvements and estimated costs.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to remove item 11 from the table for discussion.

Chairman O'Neil stated everyone should be in receipt of an estimate for the project, it's significant.

Alderman Garrity asked Bob did we hire a Grant Writer yet, do we have a Grant Writer on staff?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development replied yes there is a Grant Writer.

Alderman Garrity asked what's that person's name?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is Dennis Hebert.

Alderman Garrity asked do you know if there is any grant funding possibly to pave streets or something like that...possibly find a funding source for this or something like that? Could we get an update from the Grant Writer, maybe he could take a look into.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we could take a quick look. Normally, it's hard to fund funds for this type of thing. There are some grants you can apply for but they are transportation enhancement grants from the state or CMACK but we could take a quick look at it.

Chairman O'Neil asked Frank does that make any sense to take a look...just based on the estimate it's significant and it's probably not going to get the highest priority in the City, is that worth taking a looking at, a grant program for it?

Mr. Thomas replied it is always an option. Quite frankly, this was prepared as a contract construction estimate, actually it was finalized today so I didn't have a lot of time to look at it. What I'm going to do is go back and ask our staff to see if we can lower that cost by maybe doing more of the work in-house, working with the Traffic Department on some of the signal work and the Highway Department to do some of the street realignment and drainage work so I would say let's look at grants, let us take another look at it to see if we can reduce the cost and come back.

Alderman Garrity moved to retable item 11. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Garrity asked Bob can we get an update on that though to see if there's any grant monies available.

Mr. MacKenzie replied sure.

12. Communication from Steven Tellier, Chairman of the Board of Assessors, requesting that the City Hall Complex west wing conference room (first floor) be allocated to the Board of Assessors in order to meet space requirements.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith it, was voted to remove item 12 from the table for discussion.

Chairman O'Neil stated, Mr. MacKenzie, I believe you have a recommendation on this.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. There is a balance of \$13,000 that was the balance from the entire City Hall Renovation Project and other space improvements so that our understanding of the estimate for the Assessor's is roughly \$6,000 to \$7,000. So, there would be funds available and if the Committee didn't have any issues with that you would not have to take any action, we would make sure that that work gets done under that program.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding is the Assessor's office has been working with the Facilities Division of Highway, they have an estimated of \$5,200...it was suggested maybe an \$800 contingency or something, so I think it's a \$6,000 funding level should be adequate to complete the project. You're saying we don't need any action or would it just be a recommendation that we do it or what?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there's no action needed unless you had a concern with us moving ahead with that.

Chairman O'Neil stated so there's a general understanding where it's coming from and we're fine, so we don't have to report this to the Board at all. Okay. Thank you. Let's just say that we're in favor of it.

Alderman Smith moved to recommend approval. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated this way we've taken a vote and it's official.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. MacKenzie could some type of report be made of the Grant Writer and what the accomplishments have been and how many grants he's submitted for and what the success rate is?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Shea I know you have an item of new business.

Alderman Shea stated I'd like to have Tom Lolicata explain about the new business. This concerns the traffic light at the corner of Cilley Road and Porter Street which actually involves Alderman DeVries (Ward 8) as well as Alderman Shea (Ward 7)...Tom, could you explain a little bit about that situation and how it's kind of a safety issue.

Mr. Thomas Lolicata, Traffic Director, stated like I said you two Aldermen are both involved because it's in your wards. First of all, it's the only intersection left in the City, which has lights on the side of the poles meaning off to the side, not hanging over. Just recently within a month we made the paper...there was another good accident up there and were wondering if there was something we could do to make it safer. You and I worked together to put up those signs...

Alderman Shea interjected Alderman DeVries as well.

Mr. Lolicata stated over the past few years we've been putting in for money for that intersection and CIP. Now the time has come...the Police Department informed me there has been 34 accidents in three years up there and some of them are turnovers...we know it's speed, we know they're trying to beat the light and those are the factors that are involved. If we could get the mast arms up just like any other intersection in the City this will knock down the accident ratio...people are looking for lights in that area...these are off to the side which is how old they are. I think it's about time this Committee gives it a good look.

Chairman O'Neil stated the estimate...I think Alderman Shea has an estimate for the improvement is that something you were going to do in-house or contract out.

Mr. Lolicata replied contract out.

Chairman O'Neil asked why wouldn't you do it in-house?



Mr. Lolicata replied right now we wouldn't have the men, the time or the facilities to probably do that. The location up there is an off setting road and it would have to be done by a company that knows what they're doing. I'm talking about digging...there's two intersections up there...two corners that you have to be very careful about and I'd rather have someone with expertise working on that, somebody that does it for a living. Outside of that we will take a look at it.

Alderman Shea stated I did speak to Bob MacKenzie and Bob MacKenzie if you would address the Committee about what you found.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this is a request including some other mast arm replacements into the CIP process. I know that the Mayor is aware of it and is considering it to be in his proposal and you will know that within the next two weeks, I think he's presenting on March 28<sup>th</sup>. So, he is aware of this issue and he is considering it to be included.

Alderman Shea asked may I make a recommendation that we do advocate, this Committee, that the Mayor does include that because I do believe that it is a safety issue. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Lopez stated you said 34 accidents.

Mr. Lolicata stated that is correct, 34 accidents in three years.

Alderman Lopez stated I noticed that sometimes what they do especially in construction areas they put a line across the street temporarily and put the light in the center...has that been an option in the City?

Mr. Lolicata replied no. Those options are gone we do mast arms only now. In other words, if you're going to do a new intersection it's done through a mast arm or depending on the situation a standard 8 or 10 foot standard on the corner. But, 90% of them are mast arms because that is where most people look for their lights today.

Alderman Lopez stated my question is there is no provisions to do anything temporarily until we get the other stuff.

Mr. Lolicata replied no. Even if we ran wire across right now I wouldn't take a chance on that right now because of the telephone polls that are there right now.

Alderman Shea stated both Alderman DeVries and I have requested different signs that you have placed a certain distance away from that intersection to warn people and that obviously is something that you have done.

Mr. Lolicata stated that is the only option I have right now until the lights are completed the right way.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you know how much speed has played a factor in any of those accidents?

Mr. Lolicata replied I think in a real complete analysis...but from what I'm hearing during a certain time of year yes there's a lot of young drivers involved, trying to beat the light...they're not the only ones, don't get me wrong. The age limits I'm not going to go into, but there seems to be a lot of speed up in that area...

Chairman O'Neil stated maybe the other thing the Committee could do is also in the meantime because this is going to take a little time is maybe request the Police Department to pay some special attention. Why don't we, just for the record, get a motion on that.

Alderman Garrity moved to request the Police Department to pay special attention and put enforcement in the area. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee